



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/744,733	01/29/2001	David Huat	1200.448	3497

7590 09/02/2005  
Liniak, Berenato, Longacre & White  
6550 Rock Spring Drive  
Suite 240  
Bethesda, MD 20817

EXAMINER

DOLINAR, ANDREW M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3747

DATE MAILED: 09/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/744,733  
Filing Date: January 29, 2001  
Appellant(s): HUART ET AL.

**MAILED**

**SEP 02 2005**

**Group 3700**

---

Matthew W. Stavish  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed June 24, 2005 appealing from the Office action mailed February 10, 2005.

Art Unit: 3747

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

JP 63-309768

Uchida et al

12-1988

(translation provided herewith)

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1, 3-6 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Uchida et al (JP 63-309768). Figure 1 shows a flywheel arrangement with a friction clutch

Art Unit: 3747

including a reaction plate (3) and a torsion damper, including a spring 27 between two guide washers, penetrating into a recess as claimed.

#### **(10) Response to Argument**


Regarding claim 1:

Appellant disagrees with the examiner's interpretation that the guide washer on the left side of spring 27 that projects into the recess of reaction plate 3 as shown in Figure 1 of Uchida et al corresponds to the second guide washer as claimed. Claim 1 is deemed broad enough that either guide washer could be construed as the second guide washer. Appellant has not explained how the claim language is believed to distinguish this feature over Uchida et al.

One must bear in mind that, especially in nonchemical cases, the words in a claim are generally not limited in their meaning by what is shown or disclosed in the specification. See, e.g., *Liebel-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad Inc.*, 358 F.3d 898, 906, 69 USPQ2d 1801, 1807 (Fed. Cir. 2004).

Regarding claim 4:

An inclined portion, to the extent specified by claim 4, is defined by the rounded transition area at the innermost part of the peripheral wall defining the recess as shown in Figure 1 of Uchida et al.



Art Unit: 3747

Regarding claim 26:

Claim 26 does not specify the location of the clearance means relative to other elements with respect to the chignons. As can be seen in Figure 1 of Uchida et al (see page 6 of appellant's brief), there areas surrounding the chignon that can be construed as a clearance means to the extent claimed.

Regarding claims 3, 5 and 6, appellant does not argue specific limitations.

**(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.


For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,




Andrew M. Dolinar  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3747

Conferees:



T. Michael Argenbright  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3747



Willis Wolfe  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3747



Henry Yuen  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 3747